

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 6 were rejected, and claims 2-5 were objected to, in the Office Action dated February 3, 2004. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and all of its claims are earnestly requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al., US 6,192,239. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, in pertinent part,

"first and second antennas (1, 2) provided spaced apart from each other."

Lee neither teaches, discloses nor suggests first and second antennas that are spaced apart from each other, as acknowledged graciously in the Office action. Lee, rather, has no need for first and second antennas, since antenna 202 of Lee is connected to *either* AMPS circuitry 206 *or* PCS circuitry 208 through AMPS/PCS switch 204, but never to both, as shown in Fig. 2 and described at column 4, lines 9-11. Even when Lee is monitoring other PCS1900 base stations he devotes a complete time slot, the third, to it, as described at column 6, lines 19, rather than communicating with any two systems at once. Since Lee has no need for a first and a second antennas, it is submitted that no persons of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have seen any reason to modify Lee in the manner proposed by the Office action.

It is submitted further that no persons of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have seen any reason "to reduce interference between the antennas when communication between two different systems," contrary to the assertion in the Office action, since handset 102 will never communicate with two different systems simultaneously. Handset 102, rather, communicates through either the PCS1900 network 106 or the AMPS network 110, as described at column 3, lines 47-49, but not both. There will thus be no interference between the antennas associated with communication between two different systems to reduce. Claim 1, and dependent claim 6, are therefore believed to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Application Serial No. 09/914,595  
Response to Office Action dated April 29, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of February 3, 2004

Allowable Subject Matter:


The Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication that claims 2 through 5 contain allowable subject matter.

Conclusion:

Accordingly, in view of the reasons given above, it is submitted that all claims 1 through 6 are allowable over the cited references. Allowance of all claims 1 through 6 and of this entire application are therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Thomas E. McKiernan  
Reg. No. 37,889  
Attorney for Applicants  
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK  
Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202)783-6040